



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,251	04/19/2004	Noboru Fujiwara	09141.0005	9412
22852	7590	08/29/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			BOES, TERENCE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3682	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/826,251	FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Terence Boes	3682	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                    |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3 pages 2/4/05</u> .                                                      | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The application number (10/826,252) cited on the information discloser statement submitted February 4, 2005 appears to be a typographical error of the instant application number 10/826,251. Appropriate correction is required

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5, 10 and 13 recite the limitation "the specified first axis" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaharu (Japanese publication # 2003-312457) in view of Poertzgen (EP 0768224).

Masaharu discloses:

Re clm 1

- A brake operating member (2)
- A variable output mechanism (9,12,15) disposed between the brake operating member (2) and an output member (11b) in which a multiplying ratio of an output force is changed mechanically and non-linearly in relation to an operational input force from the brake operating member in accordance with an operating stroke of the brake operating member.
- A brake controlling unit (11a) operated in accordance with the output force applied to output member (11b).

Masaharu discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above.

Masaharu does not disclose a load sensor between the variable output mechanism and the output member

Poertzgen teaches a load sensor (42) between the variable output mechanism and the output member for the purpose of providing an actuation means for an electronically controlled brake system with high reliability (C1/L50-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a load sensor between the variable output mechanism and the output member, as taught by Poertzgen, for the purpose of providing an actuation means for an electronically controlled brake system with high reliability.

Masaharu discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above. Masaharu does not disclose a reaction force unit including at least one spring for applying a reaction force to an output member.

Poertzgen teaches a reaction force unit including at least one spring for applying a reaction force to an output member for the purpose of providing a "pedal feeling" for a driver (C1/L40-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a reaction force unit including at least one spring for applying a reaction force to an output member, as taught by Poertzgen, for the purpose of providing a "pedal feeling" for a driver.

Re clm 2

Masaharu discloses:

- An intermediate connecting member (15) pivotable about a second axis (15) perpendicular to operational plane of brake operating member (2)
- Supporting member (1) fixed on a vehicle body
- First lever integral (12a) with intermediate connecting member (15), connected with brake operating member (2) and pivotable about the second axis (15) together with the intermediate connecting member (15)

Art Unit: 3682

- Second lever (12b) integral with intermediate connecting member (15) such that second lever (12b) is apart from first lever (12a) in the axial direction of second axis (15) and is connected with output member (11b)

Re claim 3,

Masaharu fails to disclose:

- A brake controlling unit capable of controlling the brake force electrically
- An electric control unit for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output force value of the load sensor.

Poertzgen teaches a brake controlling (48) unit capable of controlling the brake force electrically to provide an actuation means for an electronically controlled brake system with high reliability (C1/L54-56).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the use of the brake controlling unit as taught by Poertzgen on the apparatus disclosed by Masaharu to provide an actuation means for an electronically controlled brake system with high reliability.

Poertzgen teaches an electric control unit for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output force value of the load sensor (C1/L 17-24) to process brake sensor signals (C2/L3-4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the use of the electric control unit as taught by Poertzgen to process brake sensor signals.

Re clm 4

Masaharu fails to disclose:

- A stroke sensor for detecting the operating stroke of the brake operating member, wherein the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor and the stroke sensor.

Poertzgen teaches a stroke sensor (36) for detecting the operating stroke of the brake operating member (28), wherein the electric control unit (see C1/L19,20) controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit (48) based on detected values of both the load sensor (42) and the stroke sensor (36) to recognize any malfunction of the actuation means and especially of the spring means (40) by verifying the consistency of the two sensed dimensions (C2/L7-13).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed a stroke sensor for detecting the operating stroke of the brake operating member, wherein the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor and the stroke sensor, as taught by Poertzgen, to recognize any malfunction of the actuation means and especially of the spring means by verifying the consistency of the two sensed dimensions.

Re clms 5

Masaharu further discloses (as best understood):

- The brake operating member (2) disposed on the supporting member (1) fixed on the vehicle body (4,5) such that the brake operating member (2) is pivotable about the specified first axis (3 or 7).

Masaharu fails to disclose:

- Stroke sensor disposed on the supporting member coaxial with the first axis for detecting the amount of pivotal movement of the brake operating member.

Poertzgen teaches a stroke sensor (36) disposed on a supporting member (38) coaxial with the first axis (34) for detecting the amount of pivotal movement of the brake operating member (28) to provide a cost effective and very reliable rotational sensor (C2/L22-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the use of a stroke sensor disposed on a supporting member coaxial with the first axis for detecting the amount of pivotal movement of the brake operating member, as taught by Poertzen, to provide a cost effective and very reliable rotational sensor.

Re clm 6

Poertzgen also discloses wherein the spring outputs a linear reaction force.



Art Unit: 3682

4. Claims 1, 6-9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaharu (Japanese publication # 2003-312457) in view of Shaw (US 6,367,886).

Masaharu discloses:

Re clm 1

- A brake operating member (2)
- A variable output mechanism (9,12,15) disposed between the brake operating member (2) and an output member (11b) in which a multiplying ratio of an output force is changed mechanically and non-linearly in relation to an operational input force from the brake operating member in accordance with an operating stroke of the brake operating member.
- A brake controlling unit (11a) operated in accordance with the output force applied to output member (11b)

Masaharu discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above.

Masaharu does not disclose a load sensor between the variable output mechanism and the output member

Shaw teaches a load sensor (15) between the variable output mechanism and the output member for the purpose of measuring the brake pedal force (C3/L55-65).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a load sensor between

Art Unit: 3682

the variable output mechanism and the output member, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of measuring the brake pedal force.

Masaharu discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above.

Masaharu does not disclose a reaction force unit including at least one spring for applying a reaction force to an output member.

Shaw teaches a reaction force unit including at least one spring (14) for applying a reaction force to an output member for the purpose of producing a measurable initial pedal response curve (C4/L5-15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a reaction force unit including at least one spring for applying a reaction force to an output member, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of producing a measurable initial pedal response curve.

Re clm 6

Shaw further discloses wherein the spring (14) outputs a linear reaction force (see chart).

Re clm 7

Masaharu, in view of Shaw, discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above. Masaharu does not disclose a damper for applying a depressing reaction force to the brake operating member.

Shaw teaches a damper (40,60) for applying a depressing reaction force to the brake operating member for the purpose of providing a dynamic dampening force (C3/L 45-50)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a damper for applying a depressing reaction force to the brake operating member, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of providing a dynamic dampening force.

Re clm 8

Masaharu, in view of Shaw, discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above. Masaharu does not disclose a brake controlling unit capable of controlling the brake force electrically, or an electric control unit for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output value of a load sensor.

Shaw teaches a brake controlling unit (see BBW, C1/L20-25) capable of controlling the brake force electrically, and an electric control unit ("automatic electric means", C1/L20-25) for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output value of a load sensor for the purpose of remotely activating a brake (C1/L24).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a brake controlling unit capable of controlling the brake force electrically, or an electric control unit for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output

Art Unit: 3682

value of a load sensor, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of remotely activating a brake.

Re clm 9

Masaharu, in view of Shaw, discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above. Masaharu does not disclose a stroke sensor or the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor and the stroke sensor.

Shaw teaches a stroke sensor (35) and the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor (15) and the stroke sensor for the purpose of allowing for variations in system packaging and pedal response curves (C5/L5-10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a stroke sensor or the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor and the stroke sensor, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of allowing for variations in system packaging and pedal response curves.

Re clm 11

Masaharu, in view of Shaw, discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above. Masaharu does not disclose a brake controlling unit capable of

controlling the brake force electrically, or an electric control unit for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output value of a load sensor.

Shaw teaches a brake controlling unit (see BBW, C1/L20-25) capable of controlling the brake force electrically, and an electric control unit ("automatic electric means", C1/L20-25) for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output value of a load sensor for the purpose of remotely activating a brake (C1/L24).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a brake controlling unit capable of controlling the brake force electrically, or an electric control unit for controlling the brake force of the brake controlling unit electrically based on the output value of a load sensor, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of remotely activating a brake.

Re clm 12

Masaharu, in view of Shaw, discloses all of the claimed subject matter as described above. Masaharu does not disclose a stroke sensor or the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor and the stroke sensor.

Shaw teaches a stroke sensor (35) and the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor (15)

Art Unit: 3682

and the stroke sensor for the purpose of allowing for variations in system packaging and pedal response curves (C5/L5-10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Masaharu and provide a stroke sensor or the electric control unit controls the brake force of the brake controlling unit based on detected values of both the load sensor and the stroke sensor, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of allowing for variations in system packaging and pedal response curves.

5. Claims 10 and 13, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaharu (Japanese publication # 2003-312457) in view of Shaw (US 6,367,886) as applied to claims 9 and 12 above, and further in view of Poertzgen (EP 0768224).

Masaharu further discloses:

- The brake operating member (2) disposed on the supporting member (1) fixed on the vehicle body (4,5) such that the brake operating member (2) is pivotable about the specified first axis (3 or 7).

Masaharu, in view of Shaw, fails to disclose:

- Stroke sensor disposed on the supporting member coaxial with the first axis for detecting the amount of pivotal movement of the brake operating member.

Poertzgen teaches a stroke sensor (36) disposed on a supporting member (38) coaxial with the first axis (34) for detecting the amount of pivotal movement of the brake

Art Unit: 3682

operating member (28) to provide a cost effective and very reliable rotational sensor (C2/L22-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the use of a stroke sensor disposed on a supporting member coaxial with the first axis for detecting the amount of pivotal movement of the brake operating member, as taught by Poertzen, to provide a cost effective and very reliable rotational sensor.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terence Boes whose telephone number is (571) 272-4898. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Ridley can be reached on (571) 272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TB  
7/25/06



RICHARD RIDLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER